

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/635,478	08/07/2003	Fang Liu	3897-0109P	1081
2292	7590 01/05/2006		EXAM	INER
	WART KOLASCH &	WONG, STEVEN B		
PO BOX 747 FALLS CHUI	PO BOX 747 FALLS CHURCH, VA 22040-0747			PAPER NUMBER
	,		3711	

DATE MAILED: 01/05/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		\mathcal{C}
	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/635,478	LIU ET AL.
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit
	Steven Wong	3711
The MAILING DATE of this communicati Period for Reply	on appears on the cover sheet w	ith the correspondence address
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILI - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communica - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, be Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ING DATE OF THIS COMMUNION CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a retion. In period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MON by statute, cause the application to become AB	CATION. reply be timely filed ITHS from the mailing date of this communication. BANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
Status		
1)⊠ Responsive to communication(s) filed or	n <u>27 October 2005</u> .	
2a)⊠ This action is FINAL . 2b)[This action is non-final.	
3) Since this application is in condition for a closed in accordance with the practice u	•	•
Disposition of Claims		
4) ⊠ Claim(s) 1-21 and 23 is/are pending in the 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are w 5) □ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ⊠ Claim(s) 1-21 and 23 is/are rejected. 7) □ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) □ Claim(s) are subject to restriction	rithdrawn from consideration.	
Application Papers		
9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Ex	aminer.	
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)	☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to	by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection	to the drawing(s) be held in abeyar	nce. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by	•	
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119		
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for f a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority doc 2. Certified copies of the priority doc 3. Copies of the certified copies of the application from the International I * See the attached detailed Office action for	uments have been received. uments have been received in A ne priority documents have been Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	Application No received in this National Stage
Attachment(s)		
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) 🗍 Interview S	Summary (PTO-413)
Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-S Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO Paper No(s)/Mail Date	Paper No(s)/Mail Date nformal Patent Application (PTO-152)

Application/Control Number: 10/635,478 Page 2

Art Unit: 3711

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

- 2. Claims 1-13, 15-21 and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Corbett (1,409,082) in view of Nystad et al. (2,957,251). Note the basis for the rejections set forth in the Office Action mailed June 27, 2005. Regarding the added limitations to claims 1 and 17, the combination of Corbett in view of Nystad as set forth in the Office Action mailed June 27, 2005 would obviously present gaps between the pieces along longitudinal and latitudinal lines.
- 3. Claim 14 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Corbett (1,409,082) in view of Nystad et al. (2,957,251) and Miller (4,494,935). Note the basis for the rejections set forth in the Office Action mailed June 27, 2005.

Response to Arguments

4. Applicant's arguments filed October 27, 2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. The applicant argues it would not have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the pieces of Corbett into the smaller pieces as taught by Nystad. The applicant contends that Nystad provides a support for the globe that is not required by the globe of Corbett and thus, impermissible hindsight is required in order to combine the teachings as set forth by the examiner.

However, these arguments are not persuasive as Corbett states that the pieces may be further divided into smaller pieces of any desired shape. Corbett provides sectors that generally extend along longitudinal lines (Figure 6). Nystad discloses that it is well known in the art of

puzzle globes to provide a plurality of pieces that follow both longitudinal and latitudinal lines. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to divide the pieces of Corbett into smaller pieces that follow both longitude and latitude lines in order to show the user the location of these lines on the globe.

Regarding the argument that Nystad includes a support for his pieces, this argument is not persuasive as Nystad includes a means (48, 50) for attaching the pieces to the support.

However, Corbett does not require the support as he provides his own self-supporting structure (note Figures 3-5). The reference to Nystad is not relied upon for teaching an attachment means or supporting means as Corbett already provides this structure.

5. In response to applicant's argument that the examiner's conclusion of obviousness is based upon improper hindsight reasoning, it must be recognized that any judgment on obviousness is in a sense necessarily a reconstruction based upon hindsight reasoning. But so long as it takes into account only knowledge which was within the level of ordinary skill at the time the claimed invention was made, and does not include knowledge gleaned only from the applicant's disclosure, such a reconstruction is proper. See *In re McLaughlin*, 443 F.2d 1392, 170 USPQ 209 (CCPA 1971).

Conclusion

6. THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE

MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO

MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after

Art Unit: 3711

date of this final action.

the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Steven Wong whose telephone number is 571-272-4416. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Wednesday 7am-5:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Gene Kim can be reached on 571-272-4463. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Steven Wong Primary Examiner Art-Unit 3711

SBW January 4, 2006